UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/894,018	06/27/2001	Alessandro Sette	2060.0320003	7107	
	710 7590 12/14/2007 CERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX, P.L.L.C.			EXAMINER	
1100 NEW YORK AVE. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ALLEN, MARIANNE P		
WASHINGTO	310N, DC 20003		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1647		
			N. II. D. III.	DEL MEDITA CODE	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/894,018	SETTE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marianne P. Allen	1647
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 S 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the second secon	s action is non-final. ince except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4)	wn from consideration. owed.	ation.
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	cepted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati ority documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 09/894,018 Page 2

Art Unit: 1647

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/17/07 has been entered.

Applicant's arguments filed 9/17/07 have been fully considered but they are not fully persuasive.

Claims 27-32, 34, 36, 62-63, 65-73, 77-78, and 81-83 are under consideration by the examiner.

The rejection of claims 28-29, 63, 73, and 78 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sette et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,689,363 B1) is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 62-63 and 77-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a new matter rejection.

Claim 62 is directed to designing a polypeptide having 10 or more CTL epitopes and 2 or more HTL epitopes.

Claim 63 is directed to designing a polypeptide having 5 or more HTL epitopes and 2 or more CTL epitopes.

Claim 77 is directed to designing a polynucleotide encoding 5 or more CTL epitopes and 2 or more HTL epitopes.

Claim 78 is directed to designing a polynucleotide encoding 5 or more HTL epitopes and 2 or more CTL epitopes.

These are not originally filed claims and these claims have been amended several times. Applicant has pointed to various points in the specification in support for these claims. None of the places pointed to provides support or contemplates constructs with these combinations of HTL and CTL epitopes.

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. While *ipsis verbis* support is not required, a fair reading of the originally filed specification must convey that these generic constructs were contemplated as being the invention. No portion of the specification sets forth the concepts set forth in claims 62-63 and 77-78. Applicant's arguments with respect to *Kao v. Unilever*, 441 F.3d. 963,968 (Fed. Cir. 2006) are not germane. The positive action or step to perform is not at issue in this application (i.e. how to make the construct). The issue is what construct does the specification contemplate making. The claimed numbers of CTL and HTL epitopes required to be included are not a step that is "so straightforward" in the context of *Kao v. Unilever*. This decision concerned a method for removing keratotic plugs from skin with a cosmetic article by wetting the skin or said cosmetic article; applying onto the skin said cosmetic article; and peeling off said cosmetic article after drying. The written description issue in this decision concerned the positive action or step to perform not the identity of what to apply.

Art Unit: 1647

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marianne P. Allen whose telephone number is 571-272-0712. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 5:30 am - 2:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath N. Rao can be reached on 571-272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marianne P. Allen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647

mpa